

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| 10/085,894 | 02/28/2002 | Jason C. Brooke | 8266-0783 | 3459 |
| 759 | 90 05/01/2003 | | | |
| Intellectual Property Group Bose McKinney & Evans LLP 2700 First Indiana Plaza 135 North Pennsylvania Street | | | EXAMINER BANNAPRADIST, LISA M | |
| | | | | |
| | | | Indianapolis, IN 46204 | |
| | 3676 | | | |
| | DATE MAILED: 05/01/2003 | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Applicati n No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | ^ | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | 10/085,894 | BROOKE ET AL. | | | | |
| Since riouen cummuny | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app | Lisa Bannapradist | rresp, ndence address | | | | |
| Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 February 2003</u> . | | | | | | |
| ` <u> </u> | s action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>6-9 and 20-34</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>6-9 and 20-31</u> is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>32-34</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | |
| 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/085,894

Art Unit: 3676

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2,663,048 to Ross, Jr. et al.

Ross discloses a caster assembly including a support deck (18), base frame (20-23), and intermediate frame (25) coupled to the base frame (at 50 in Fig. 3) and configured to move vertically relative to the base frame. Ross further discloses a caster (40), support shaft (33), locking member (47), engagement member (all of 60, 61 and 35), and flange (35) substantially as claimed by applicant. The support shaft is coupled for pivotal movement relative to the ground (F) between a lowered position (see Fig. 2) and a raised position (see Fig. 1). The locking member (47) moves between a first position (see Figs. 2 and 5) and a second position (see Fig. 1) and allows the support shaft (33) to pivotally move in a first direction. The engagement member (60, 61) prevents the support shaft from pivotally moving in a second direction. At least one flange (35) is coupled to the support shaft.

Ross discloses the caster assembly for use with furniture but fails to expressly disclose the use of the caster assembly with a bed. However, it is obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at Application/Control Number: 10/085,894

Art Unit: 3676

the time the invention was made to modify Ross's invention for use with a bed because it is well known in the art to use adjustable caster assemblies with hospital beds where it is necessary to mobilize the bed to move a patient and also to immobilize the bed when necessary.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 6-9 and 20-31 are allowable over the prior art of record. However, the application is not in condition for allowance.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed February 24, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections. Applicant's arguments fail to specifically point out how the language of the new limitations in claim 32 (specifically the recitations drawn to a "support deck", "base frame" and "intermediate frame") patentably distinguishes them from the prior art references. The limitations added in amended claim 32 do not prove to overcome the Ross, Jr. reference.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/085,894

Art Unit: 3676

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Lisa Bannapradist whose telephone number is 703-305-4806.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs and every other Friday from 8:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on 703-308-3179. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9326 for regular

communications and 703-872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-4177.

Chuck Mah

Primary Examiner

Technology Center 3600

lb

April 27, 2003